

REMARKS

The above Amendment and the following Remarks are in Reply to the non-final Office Action dated 12/12/03 in this Application. In the above Amendment, Claims 1, 4, 16, 18, 27 and 28 have been amended based on the telephone interview conducted with the Examiner on April 8, 2004. 32 Claims remain pending in this Application of which Claims 1, 18, 27 and 28 are in independent form for reconsideration and further examination. In light of the telephone interview and this Reply, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of this Application.

Objection to Claim 16

The Examiner had objected to Claim 16. Applicant has amended Claim 16 as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection with respect to Claim 16.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In paragraph 3, page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 18, 25-26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hannah et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,784,581). In light of the above Amendments to independent Claims 1, 18, 27 and 28, and the Remarks that follow, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 18, 25-26 and 28:

Applicant has amended the claims as discussed during the telephone interview. As discussed, the limitations of Claims 18, 25-26 and 28 are not disclosed in Hannah. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner's rejection of claim 18, 25-26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hannah be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-17:

In paragraph 4, page 3, the Examiner rejected Claims 1,3-6, and 8-17 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hannah in view of Kikinis (5,841,424) and further in view of Huang (6,280,252). In light of the above Amendments to independent Claims 1, 18, 27 and 28, and based on the telephone interview of April 8, 2004, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has relied on Kikinis (US Patent No. 5,841,424) stating that Kikinis teaches "a conversion circuit (USB adapter Fig. 6) coupled between USB devices (col. 5, lines 52-65)". (Office Action, Page 6, Section 6). First, there is no motivation or suggestion to combine Hannah and Kikinis. Second, assuming arguendo, even if Hannah and Kikinis were combined, the combination will not disclose the elements of amended Claim 1. For example, Kikinis discloses a USB keyboard which is different from the "expansion card" of the amended claims.

Huang does not add to the deficiency of Hannah and Kikinis, because first, there is no motivation or suggestion to combine Hannah, Kikinis and Huang; and second, assuming arguendo, even if Hannah, Kikinis and Huang were combined, the combination will not disclose the elements of amended Claim 1. Huang discloses a "cable connector" in "an insulative housing defining plurality of passageways, a plurality of terminals received in the passageways of the insulative housing, an upper shell, a lower shell and a casing portion enveloping the upper shell and the lower shell." [Huang, Abstract]. The cable connector assembly of Huang does not disclose the limitations of amended Claim 1, or 3-6 and 8-17 that depend from Claim 1. Therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed. Accordingly, withdrawal of Examiner's rejection of Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-17 is respectfully requested.

Claims 19 and 29:

In paragraph 5, page 7, the Examiner rejected Claims 19 and 29 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hannah in view of Huang (6,280,252). Claim 19 depends from Claim 18 and Claim 29 depends from Claim 28, therefore, as discussed above, in light of the above Amendments to independent Claims 1, 18, 27 and 28, and based on the telephone interview of April 8, 2004, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 20-24 and 30-34:

In paragraph 6, page 7, the Examiner rejected Claims 20-24 and 30-34 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hannah in view of Kikinis. Claims 20-24 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 18 and Claims 30-34 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 28, therefore, as discussed above, in light of the above Amendments to independent Claims 1, 18, 27 and 28, and based on the telephone interview of April 8, 2004, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Accordingly, withdrawal of Examiner's rejection of Claims 20-24 and 30-34 is respectfully requested.

Claim 27:

In paragraph 7, page 9, the Examiner rejected Claim 27 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view of Hannah. In light of the above Amendments to independent Claims 27, and based on the telephone interview of April 8, 2004, this rejection is respectfully traversed. Accordingly, withdrawal of Examiner's rejection of Claim 27 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes Claims 1, 3-6, 8-34 are allowable, and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned Attorney at (949) 955-1920.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated:

5/12/04

Tejinder Singh
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 39,535
Klein, O'Neill & Singh, LLP
2 Park Plaza, Suite 510
Irvine, CA 92614
Tel: 949 955 1920
Fax: 949 955 1921